

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being added or cancelled.

Claims 1, 8 and 15 are currently being amended.

This amendment and reply amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-39 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,161,105 to Kugimiya et al.; claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugimiya et al.; claims 3, 10, 17, 22, 27 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugimiya et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,359,849 to Palmquist; claims 4, 11, 18, 23, 28 and 33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugimiya et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,727,082 to Sugishima; claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 19, 24, 26, 29, 31 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugimiya et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,563 to Hon et al.; claims 6, 13, 20, 25, 30 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugimiya et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,944,464 to Muranaga; and claims 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugimiya et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0153306 to Tanner et al. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

The final Office Action asserts that Kugimiya discloses, in column 2, lines 28-34, the claim feature of “a proper noun identification notation generation section for generating a

notation to identify a proper noun in the second language”. However, Kugimiya merely describes (1) examining whether or not words are registered as compound words in a dictionary means, and (2) translating the compound words into a sentence in a target language when the compound words are registered as compound words in the dictionary means. Kugimiya does not teach or suggest the features of generating a notation in a first language to identify a proper noun described in a second language.

Independent claims 1, 8 and 15 have each been amended to clarify the above features so as to patentably distinguish over Kugimiya.

Furthermore, independent claim 1 recites the generating of a notation in a first language to identify a proper noun described in a second language. In order to specify, in a first language, a proper noun in a second language, wherein the proper noun in the first language corresponding to the proper noun in the second language is not unique, e.g. “Aachen” (see paragraph [0017] in the present specification) has at least two different sounds, i.e., an English pronounced sound and a German pronounced sound, a proper noun dictionary must store all possible proper nouns in the first language corresponding to the proper noun in the second language. Furthermore, for a user not familiar with the phonetic characters and the phonetic symbols (see paragraph [0040] in the present specification), reading or inputting the proper noun in the first language would be difficult, and the proper noun dictionary, which stores a pair of proper nouns in the first language and in the second language, may not be referred to.

In the present invention, such as exemplified in embodiment 2, a user can uniquely specify a proper noun in a second language, by viewing a table, such as the one shown in Figure 5 of the drawings, which displays the proper noun in the second language with a label corresponding to it, e.g. , “Place name 2”. According to this feature of the present application, any user can obtain a correct translation result with a high processing speed.

Accordingly, the present application as exemplified by the independent claims under rejection can be applied to, e.g., an English to Chinese translation, in which a non-Chinese user is not familiar with reading and understanding Chinese characters.

Kugimiya is quite different from the present application as exemplified by the independent claims under rejection. Kugimiya does not disclose, teach or suggest the generating of a notation in a first language to identify a proper noun described in a second language, and it does not disclose, teach or suggest displaying a pair including the proper noun and the notation. For example, column 1, lines 64-67 of Kugimiya describes displaying a source language and a target language that has been translated, but this is different from displaying a proper noun and a notation as a pair.

On page 4 of the final Office Action, in the “Response to Arguments” section, it asserts that Kugimiya describes the displaying of both “OPEC” and “Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries” in Figure 15, in which “OPEC” is a notation of the proper noun “Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries”. However, both “OPEC” and “Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries” are in a same language, and thus it cannot meet the specific features of displaying a **notation in a first language** and a **proper noun in a second language** as a pair. Rather, Kugimiya displays an acronym in a first language and its corresponding proper noun in the first language, which is clearly different from the specific features recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 patentably distinguish over Kugimiya for these additional reasons.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the final Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 16, 2010

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5535
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George Cl. Beck
Registration No. 38,072

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819